

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,245	YOKOHARA, TOYOAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
ERNESTO GARCIA	3679		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Non-Final</u>		
(1) <u>ERNESTO GARCIA</u>	(3) _____		
(2) <u>Mr. Louis J. DelJuidice</u> .	(4) _____.		
Date of Interview: <u>3 June 2009</u>	Time: <u>3:45PM</u>		
Type of Interview:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)		
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	If Yes, provide a brief description: .		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
n/a			
Claims discussed:			
1, 3, 5, 10, 11			
Prior art documents discussed:			
n/a			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:			
<i>See Continuation Sheet</i>			
Part III.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. DeJuidice to place the case in condition for allowance. The examiner pointed out that "the opening" in claim 1, lines 15 and 19, lacked proper antecedent basis. Other issues regarded the clarification what feature of the large and small dimples render comparison. The examiner suggested amending the large and small dimples to recite that their diameter are different. The examiner called to clarify claim 3 as it was still unclear. Mr. DeJuidice explained the intent of the subject matter and the examiner suggested setting forth another tier of first dimples. The examiner also brought the attention that claims 5 and 11 are respectively identical to claims 1 and 10. Mr. DeJuidice agreed to cancel these claims. See examiner's amendment for changes made.